United Nations A/67/883–S/2013/332

General Assembly
Security Council

Distr.: General
5 June 2013
English
Original: Arabic

General Assembly
Sixty-seventh session
Agenda item 36
The situation in the Middle East

Security Council
Sixty-eighth year

Identical letters dated 3 June 2013 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council

On instructions from my Government, I wish to inform you that the Israeli air force has continued to violate Lebanese airspace, intensifying its incursions over Lebanon, including flights at low altitude over Beirut, the capital, in the last few days. Such activities are a blatant violation of my country's sovereignty and the relevant international resolutions, particularly Security Council resolution 1701 (2006). They are also a clear infringement of the Charter of the United Nations and the principles and provisions of international law.

On behalf of my Government, I call on the Security Council to condemn those violations in the strongest possible terms and prevail on Israel to end its violations of Lebanese sovereignty, whether in the air, at sea or on land, and fulfil all of its obligations under Security Council resolution 1701 (2006). I also take this opportunity to reiterate my Government's commitment to its obligations under international resolutions.

I should be grateful if you would circulate the present letter as a document of the sixty-seventh session of the General Assembly, under agenda item 36, and of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Nawaf **Salam**
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

13-35536 (E) 070613 070613

Please recycle

United Nations A/67/884

General Assembly

Distr.: General
7 June 2013

Original: English

Sixty-seventh session
Agenda item 20
Sustainable development

Letter dated 5 June 2013 from the Permanent Representative of Uzbekistan to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to inform you that in 2013 the International Fund for Saving the Aral Sea celebrates its twentieth anniversary (see annex).

Uzbekistan first came up with the initiative to unite the efforts of the region and the international community to overcome the consequences of the Aral Sea crisis, maintain the ecological balance of the area and create a clean environment for the population. During the summit held in Tashkent in January 1993, the Heads of State of Central Asia decided to establish the regional organization for saving the Aral Sea.

The General Assembly of the United Nations, by its resolution 63/133 of 11 December 2008, invited the International Fund for Saving the Aral Sea to participate as an observer in its sessions and in its work. The United Nations thereby recognizes the Fund as a cooperative partner that shares its goals and aspirations. Adoption of the resolution also provides the Fund with an opportunity to strengthen its relations with the United Nations system.

In 2013, the location of the Executive Committee of the International Fund for Saving the Aral Sea will move to Tashkent for three years. During this period, Uzbekistan, as the chair of the Fund, is committed to coordinating cooperation at the national and international levels in order to use existing water resources more effectively and to improve the environmental and socioeconomic situation in the Aral Sea basin.

In this regard, it is important to note that the Government of Uzbekistan has recently adopted a programme of actions towards environmental protection for the period of 2013-2017. About $2 billion will be allocated for the implementation of the programme, including comprehensive monitoring of the environmental situation in the northern areas of the Surkhondaryo region.

It would be appreciated if the present letter and its annex could be circulated as a document of the sixty-seventh session of the General Assembly, under agenda item 20.

(*Signed*) Dilyor **Khakimov**
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

13-35746 (E) 120613 120613

Please recycle

Annex to the letter dated 5 June 2013 from the Permanent Representative of Uzbekistan to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

[Original: Russian]

Twentieth anniversary of the International Fund for Saving the Aral Sea

The year 2013 marks the twentieth anniversary of the International Fund for Saving the Aral Sea.

In 1992 Uzbekistan first launched the initiative to unite the efforts of States in the region and the international community to address the impacts of the Aral Sea crisis, maintain the ecological balance and establish a clean living environment for the population.

At the summit held in Tashkent in January 1993, the Heads of State of Central Asia and Kazakhstan supported Uzbekistan's initiative to establish a regional organization for saving the Aral Sea.

The problems of the Aral Sea date from long ago, but in the 1960s they acquired threatening proportions. Population growth and rising water needs, large-scale land reclamation, the continuing development of agriculture and the frequent occurrence of consecutive low-water years have created the conditions for one of the biggest global environmental disasters in recent history — the drying up of what used to be one of the most beautiful bodies of water on the planet.

Not only the population living directly in the disaster zone, but the population of the entire region of Central Asia and Kazakhstan lives in an area that is under constant environmental threat and subject to factors that negatively affect their quality of life, their health and the gene pool.

The Fund and its organizations have been in existence for 20 years and in this short time they have become an effective platform to support the negotiation process and take consolidated action on issues of regional water use. Countries of the Central Asian region and Kazakhstan can use this cooperation mechanism to address key issues in improvement of the environmental situation in the Aral Sea region, as well as the management and distribution of transboundary water resources.

The granting to the Fund in 2008 of observer status in the General Assembly has opened new perspectives for its activities at the global level.

There is no doubt that the Fund has been successful in drawing the attention of the international community, many national Governments and a wide range of international institutions to the problem of the Aral Sea.

The World Bank, the Asian Development Bank, a number of international organizations and various States are currently participating in and providing support for a variety of projects designed to improve this unfortunate regional situation that threatens the gene pool of the population.

Water is of crucial importance to the future development of Uzbekistan. Having recognized the social significance of irrigation and developed a sound national water sector policy, Uzbekistan has not only maintained its irrigation

capacity since gaining independence, but also successfully modernized and improved its irrigation systems. Uzbekistan has made radical changes to the way it manages its water. Integrated water resources management principles, modern water-saving technologies, and automated control and management systems for water distribution have been implemented widely. Measures have also been taken, inter alia, to improve the technical condition of water facilities and the reclamation of land and to diversify agricultural production. These measures include the following:

- In 1993 strict limits were placed on water use, while in 2003 there was a transition to a watershed management approach for water resources, with constant improvement of legislation on water use.
- Efforts have been made to diversify agricultural production. Water-intensive crops such as rice and cotton have been replaced as the Government has encouraged less water-intensive agriculture, with crops such as grains and melons, and the cultivation of orchards and vineyards. Compared to the 1980s, the area under cotton has dropped from 2 million to 1.2 million ha and the area under rice has shrunk from 180,000 to 40,000 ha.
- The Government has earmarked substantial funding from its budget for the improvement of water management infrastructure. The World Bank, the Asian Development Bank, the Islamic Development Bank and other international financial institutions have provided over $1.2 billion of investment funds over the past 10 years for the repair and modernization of irrigation and drainage facilities.
- There has been wide implementation of water-saving irrigation technologies, including drip irrigation and irrigation through flexible tubing or tape. Over the past three years, drip irrigation systems have been introduced over an area of 5,500 ha, and this area will expand by an additional 5,000 ha each year. As a result, the coefficient of irrigation system efficiency is improving and water losses are being reduced.
- In accordance with the State Programme for 2008-2012, the Government earmarked $500 million from its budget on measures for reclamation of irrigated land. The work already carried out has reclaimed 1.2 million ha of land.
- The Land Reclamation Fund of the Ministry of Finance was established in 2007 to improve the condition of reclaimed land in the Republic.

As a result of the measures taken, Uzbekistan is the only country in the region to have reduced its water intake compared to the 1980s, with a 21 per cent reduction from 64 billion to 51 billion m^3.

Over the past 15 years, water has been brought to 380,000 ha of the Amudaria river delta and local reservoirs have been built to encourage the recovery of flora and fauna. In order to prevent further movement of salt and dust in the zone affected by the Aral crisis, trees have been planted over an area of 740,000 ha, including an area of 310,000 ha of dry seabed.

These figures are a clear indication that Uzbekistan is taking an active role in the practical resolution of the issues of the Aral Sea basin.

By the same token, the following measures, to be implemented at the regional level, are the key priorities for efforts to address the impact of the drying up of the Aral Sea and in environmental rehabilitation of the Aral Sea basin:

- The creation of local reservoirs on the dry bed of the Aral Sea and bringing water to the delta reservoirs to prevent sand and salt storms and restore biodiversity and the delta's ecosystem.
- Planting trees on the dry bed of the Aral Sea, sand-dune stabilization and reduction of the leaching of toxic aerosols from the dry seabed.
- Provision of drinking water and outfitting of community and treatment facilities with water sterilization devices, refurbishment of water intake facilities with chlorination systems and other measure to improve the living conditions and health of the population of the Aral Sea region.
- A comprehensive study of the impact of the growing environmental crisis in the Aral Sea region on the state of health and the gene pool of the population, early warning and prevention concerning the widespread human diseases that are specific to the region, the deployment of a specialized network of preventive and treatment facilities for the population living in the area, and the implementation of a comprehensive programme of measures to ensure rapid growth in social infrastructure.

In connection with the Aral Sea tragedy and the recovery measures, the solution to this problem is directly linked to the rational use of the water resources of the region's transboundary rivers, which have always met the vital needs of the States located in their basins.

In this connection, there is increasing concern at the growing aspirations of the upstream States to implement a hydroelectric policy that imposes their hydraulic regime on the rivers, together with their plans to implement extremely contradictory projects for the construction of major hydraulic facilities at the sources of the largest transboundary rivers.

In addressing the issues that arise in connection with the management of transboundary water resources, Uzbekistan believes that any activities making use of those resources should take into account the interests of all States located in the basin and should be implemented according to the generally accepted norms of international law.

Uzbekistan is the only State in Central Asia to have signed both the Convention on the Protection and Use of Transboundary Watercourses and International Lakes of 17 March 1992 and the Convention on the Law of the Non-navigational Uses of International Watercourses of 21 May 1997.

The increasing application of international law and better use of the Fund's capacity offer reference points for future joint action on all complex problems, taking account of the interests of all countries in the region.

In Uzbekistan, the Fund is considered an important platform for cooperation among States of the region in addressing water resource management and environmental protection.

Uzbekistan, as one of the Fund's founding States, attaches great significance to the comprehensive strengthening of the Fund's activities.

In 2013, the presidency of the Fund will be transferred from Kazakhstan to Uzbekistan for the next three-year period. During its presidency, Uzbekistan intends to give priority to strengthening regional dialogue in accordance with the norms of international law, making better use of the Fund's capacity, improving the socioeconomic and water-environmental situation in the Aral Sea region and expanding the Fund's international contacts.

The countries of the region should make joint efforts to enhance the international standing and role of the Fund and the effective implementation of the Third Aral Sea Basin Programme. The Programme includes 68 projects for implementation in Uzbekistan alone, for a total cost of $2,715,400,000.

During its presidency of the Fund, Uzbekistan intends to increase cooperation in the context of the Fund and to support effective action by the Executive Committee in Tashkent.

United Nations A/67/885

General Assembly

Distr.: General
10 June 2013

Original: English

Sixty-seventh session
Agenda item 75
Oceans and the law of the sea

Letter dated 7 June 2013 from the Permanent Representative of Australia to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to advise that, pursuant to General Assembly resolution 66/231 of 24 December 2011, a workshop for the South-West Pacific region was held from 25 to 27 February 2013 in Brisbane, Australia, under the auspices of the United Nations, in support of the first phase of the first assessment cycle of the Regular Process for Global Reporting and Assessment of the State of the Marine Environment, including Socioeconomic Aspects. I have the honour to transmit to you the report of the workshop (see annex).

I kindly request that the present note and its annex be circulated as a document of the General Assembly, under agenda item 75.

(*Signed*) Gary **Quinlan**

13-36053 (E) 180613

Please recycle

Annex to the letter dated 7 June 2013 from the Permanent Representative of Australia to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

Report of the sixth workshop held under the auspices of the United Nations in support of the Regular Process for Global Reporting and Assessment of the State of the Marine Environment, including Socioeconomic Aspects

Brisbane, Australia, 25-27 February 2013

I. Overview

1. The present report focuses on critical information for the Regular Process for Global Reporting and Assessment of the State of the Marine Environment, including Socioeconomic Aspects, and the Group of Experts as they develop the South-West Pacific region component of the first global integrated marine assessment (hereafter referred to as the world ocean assessment). It highlights the findings of the workshop in relation to the South-West Pacific region — in particular, information gaps, capacity needs for marine assessments in the region, suggestions for development of the world ocean assessment, and the next steps to be taken in the production of the assessment. These insights are synthesized from the various presentations and breakout group discussions, as well as the concluding session of the workshop. The annexes to the report provide other details of the workshop and its outcomes, including the agenda, list of participants, summaries of the presentations and an analysis of existing marine assessments in the South-West Pacific region, including breakout group results.[1]

II. Background: objectives, history and participants

2. Following the recommendations made at the meeting of the Ad Hoc Working Group of the Whole on the Regular Process in June 2011 and endorsed by the General Assembly in its resolution 66/231 of 24 December 2011, the workshop for the South-West Pacific region was held from 25 to 27 February 2013 in Brisbane, Australia, under the auspices of the United Nations in support of the Regular Process for Global Reporting and Assessment of the State of the Marine Environment, including Socioeconomic Aspects.

3. The objectives of the workshop were to:

- Enhance dialogue between marine experts within Governments, intergovernmental organizations and regional initiatives
- Develop an inventory of environmental and socioeconomic marine assessments
- Consider the linkages among assessments, including driving factors and the state of the marine environment

[1] All annexes to the report are available from the workshop website (www.environment.gov.au/coasts/international/regularprocess/) and Regular Process website (www.un.org/Depts/los/global_reporting/global_reporting.htm).

- Identify marine assessment capacity-building needs and consider means to address those needs.

4. The Australian Government hosted the workshop with the technical and financial support of the Marine Biodiversity Hub of the National Environmental Research Program; the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization; the Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme; the Australian Agency for International Development; the Division for Ocean Affairs and the Law of the Sea of the Office of Legal Affairs, United Nations Secretariat; the United Nations Environment Programme; the Government of France; the Government of New Zealand; the Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat; the Secretariat of the Pacific Community; the Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency; and Conservation International.

5. The workshop was facilitated by its Co-Chairs, Tuiloma Neroni Slade (Secretary-General of the Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat and Pacific Ocean Commissioner) and Peter Harris (member of the Group of Experts established pursuant to paragraph 209 of General Assembly resolution 65/37 A). Travis Bover (Australian Government) co-chaired the third day of proceedings in the absence of Mr. Slade. Participants included experts from 10 countries in the South-West Pacific region, experts from countries outside the region, many local, regional and international organizations, and one member of the Group of Experts.[2]

III. Conduct of the workshop

6. The workshop was conducted in accordance with its agenda.[3]

7. A series of presentations to explain the world ocean assessment and to set the context of its South-West Pacific region component was provided on the first day.

8. The second day was dedicated to the breakout groups, in which participants self-selected into four groups, in line with the four major sections of the world ocean assessment: biophysical (part III, chaps. 4-7); food security and food safety (part IV, chaps. 10-15); socioeconomics (part III, chaps. 3 and 8, and part V, chaps. 17-30); and marine biological diversity (part VI, chaps. 34-43). The breakout groups were conducted according to the guidance developed to ensure comparable outcomes that reflected the objectives of the workshop.

9. Presentations containing highlights of the discussions of the breakout groups were provided on the third day. Following these presentations, the Co-Chair, Peter Harris, provided a recap of the means by which the participants should engage further in the conduct of the world ocean assessment, drew attention to the workshop's key achievements and declared the workshop closed.

[2] The list of participants is available at www.un.org/Depts/los/global_reporting/australia_2013/Participant_List.pdf.

[3] Available at www.un.org/Depts/los/global_reporting/australia_2013/Workshop_Agenda.pdf.

IV. South-West Pacific region information gaps

10. Prior to the workshop, an inventory of key sources of information for the world ocean assessment was produced. Using this as a starting point, a number of gaps were identified throughout the presentations and discussions, by the breakout groups and in the closing discussion, including the following:

- Effects of river discharges on the marine environment, including both freshwater volume and nutrient inputs
- Socioeconomic impacts of freshwater fluxes, sea-level rise, the effects of El Niño, and changes in ocean circulation
- Ocean chemistry observations (pCO2, nutrients)
- Meteorological phenomena
- Ocean acidification
- Cumulative effects of multiple stresses on the marine environment
- Large-scale data on primary production, cycling of nutrients, surface layer and plankton
- Functioning of open-ocean ecosystems
- Finer scale information on biological processes/ecosystems in coastal areas
- Socioeconomic implications of primary production trends and other factors affecting food webs
- Understanding of the impacts of multiple stresses on carbonate production rates
- Carbonate production, particularly in regard to the longevity of islands
- Data on artisanal and coastal fisheries
- Data on recreational fisheries
- Impacts of large-scale fisheries on the ecosystem
- Understanding and quantification of ecosystem services in the region
- Understanding of traditional knowledge and cultural uses of oceans in the region
- Region-specific information on shipping and ports (despite it being an important issue for the region that is likely to increase in importance in the future)
- Gas hydrates (considered to be a possible emerging issue for the region)
- Ocean thermal energy conservation (viewed as a possible emerging issue)
- Resilience to changing impacts: terrestrial, over-fishing, climate change, national disaster
- Seagrass distribution and trends
- Data on non-commercial fish species

- Animals in the coastal environment: status, trend and threat data, and marine mammal information
- Sharks: status and trends
- Nature and condition of biodiversity in high seas areas

11. An analysis of existing marine assessments[4] provided details of information sources and gaps for each chapter of the world ocean assessment, along with other information intended to be of use in the preparation of the assessment as it relates to the South-West Pacific region. The analysis contains a record of the inputs to and discussions at the workshop, as well as the preliminary inventory completed prior to the workshop.

V. Capacity needs for marine assessments in the South-West Pacific region

12. Drawing on the presentations and plenary and breakout group discussions, participants made the following observations regarding capacity needs and the measures to address those needs for the South-West Pacific region:

- The production of global marine assessments should be linked to ongoing efforts to support regional (led by the Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme) and national state-of-the-environment reporting and streamlining of reporting arrangements (led by the Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat/Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme). By providing capacity development and other support to these initiatives, the region will be better placed to contribute to and benefit from the Regular Process.
- The production of global marine assessments should be done in a way that provides mentoring and learning opportunities for less experienced scientists and practitioners.
- There is a need to actively facilitate the involvement of practitioners from Pacific island countries and territories in the production of global marine assessments, including improved communication efforts to ensure awareness of the opportunity to be involved, assistance in registering for the Pool of Experts and resourcing support for and formal recognition of work done.
- A great deal of data and information exists but it is often not readily identifiable or accessible. Enhanced regional and national capacities to store, access, share and interrogate data and information would assist the production of global marine assessments and facilitate the meeting of regional and national objectives.
- Resourcing is a substantial constraint on the capacity of the region to contribute to the production of global marine assessments. This can in part be addressed by the nature, scope and process for the development of assessments that more deliberately support national and regional objectives, as well as the objective of producing a global report. For example, the global marine

[4] Available at www.un.org/Depts/los/global_reporting/australia_2013/Analysis_assessments.pdf.

assessment could provide region-specific information and access to the underpinning data and information.

- Because of the limited capacity of the region to engage in the drafting of the world ocean assessment, the review stage might be an efficient point for the region to ensure that regional information and perspectives are appropriately reflected in the assessment. A second workshop or network among involved practitioners may provide mechanisms for doing this. Similarly, providing support to an appropriate Pacific regional organization to facilitate and coordinate ongoing regional engagement may be useful.

VI. Suggestions for the development of the world ocean assessment

13. Throughout the workshop, a continual theme of discussion was on how to ensure that the value of the world ocean assessment was maximized, not only on a global scale, but also at the regional and national levels. Key observations made in this context included:

- The world ocean assessment needs to provide information in an accessible and usable way. Consideration should be given to the creation of more concise and policy-focused communication products, the presentation of regionally disaggregated analysis, and mechanisms for facilitating access to the underpinning data and information.
- Global assessment and reporting through the world ocean assessment should seek to link with and support regional and national assessment and reporting processes. This would enhance efficiency, quality and outcomes at all levels and garner Pacific island country buy-in to the Regular Process.
- The process of developing global marine assessments should be designed to maximize opportunities for capacity development, for example, by facilitating mentoring relationships and partnerships, and by reinforcing and building on existing national and regional efforts.
- An important function of the first world ocean assessment will be to identify and prioritize gaps in knowledge. Prioritization will require policy decisions to be made once gaps in knowledge have been identified.
- A great deal of assessment and reporting involves the repeated synthesis of existing assessments and not the generation of new data. The world ocean assessment can highlight this issue and identify potential priority areas for the generation of new data.
- An important role for the world ocean assessment is to reinforce the importance of oceans to the global sustainable development agenda and the unique role of small island developing States in managing large areas of the world's oceans. This aspect is of particular relevance to the South-West Pacific region.
- Consideration of trends and the future outlook for the oceans, as well as assessment of their current state, would significantly enhance the value of global marine assessment reports.

VII. Next steps in the production of the world ocean assessment

14. The results of the workshop will be shared with the Group of Experts to inform the drafting of the South-West Pacific region component of the world ocean assessment. The assessment timeline includes the following key steps:

- Further nominations by States to the Pool of Experts
- Preparation of working papers for each chapter
- Preparation of draft chapters based on working papers (October 2013-March 2014)
- Production of the first draft of the first world ocean assessment (April-May 2014)
- Peer review and review process (June-August 2014)
- Final draft (September 2014)
- Submission to the Ad Hoc Working Group of the Whole on the Regular Process (December 2014)
- Publication (February 2015).

15. Participants were asked to send any additional sources of information and names of experts to Travis Bover (regularprocessSWPAC@environment.gov.au) for inclusion in the present report. Participants were also encouraged to join the Pool of Experts and, if selected by the Group of Experts, to engage in drafting the South-West Pacific region component of the world ocean assessment.

United Nations A/67/886–S/2013/336

General Assembly
Security Council

Distr.: General
11 June 2013

Original: English

General Assembly
Sixty-seventh session
Agenda items 33 and 34

Prevention of armed conflict

Protracted conflicts in the GUAM area and their implications for international peace, security and development

Security Council
Sixty-eighth year

Letter dated 5 June 2013 from the Permanent Representative of Armenia to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

Upon instructions from my Government, I have the honour to draw your attention to the ongoing violations of the ceasefire by the armed forces of the Republic of Azerbaijan recorded for the month of May 2013 (see annex).

I should be grateful if you would circulate the present letter and its annex as a document of the General Assembly, under agenda items 33 and 34, and of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Garen **Nazarian**
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

13-36007 (E) 140613

Please recycle

Annex to the letter dated 5 June 2013 from the Permanent Representative of Armenia to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

Violations of the ceasefire by the armed forces of the Republic of Azerbaijan, 1-31 May 2013

1. On the borderline of the Nagorno Karabakh Republic:

   Total number of violations — 1,150

   Total number of shots ~ 4,957

   AK ~ 3,734, PK ~ 627, SVD ~ 399, DSHK ~ 48, RPK ~ 47, Black Arrow ~ 27, Istiglal ~ 69, Utyos ~ 5, AGS-17~ 1

2. On the borderline of the Republic of Armenia (see table below):

   Total number of violations — 118

   Total number of shots ~ 1,399

   AK ~ 671, PK ~ 465, SVD ~ 150, DSHK ~ 26, RPK ~ 20, Black Arrow ~ 67

No.	*Date*	*Direction*	*Time*	*Type of weapon*	*Ammunition*	*Results of violations*
1.	1 May	Aygedzor	0030	PK	20	
2.				AK	30	
3.			0040	PK	25	
4.				SVD	10	
5.		Chinari	1230	Black Arrow	3	
6.		Mehrab	2110	AK	3	
7.	2 May	Aygepar	1025	AK	10	
8.			2205		1	
9.	3 May	N. Karmiraghbyur	0045	AK	9	
10.		Lev	1300-1900	Black Arrow	40	
11.	4 May	Chinari	0945	SVD	1	
12.		Aygepar	1205		1	
13.		Aygedzor	1950	PK	100	
14.		Lev	2130		15	

Abbreviations: PK, Kalashnikov machine gun; SVD, 7.9-mm sniper weapon; AK, Kalashnikov rifle; DSHK, 12.7-mm machine gun; RPK, 5.45-mm machine gun; Istiglal, 14.5-mm machine gun; Black Arrow, 12.7-mm sniper weapon; Utyos, 12.7-mm machine gun; AGS-17, automatic grenade launcher.

No.	Date	Direction	Time	Type of weapon	Ammunition	Results of violations
15.	5 May	Sadarak	1130	AK	3	
16.		Chinari	1220	SVD	4	
17.			1550		1	
18.				Black Arrow	1	
19.			1710	AK	5	
20.			2010	PK	15	
21.				SVD	3	
22.		Aygepar	1515	SVD	2	
23.		Aygedzor	2020	AK	35	
24.				PK	20	
25.	6 May	Movses	0730	AK	2	
26.			2045		7	
27.		Chinari	1050	SVD	2	
28.		Mehrab	1315		3	
29.		Tigranashen	1430	AK	1	
30.		Aygepar	1800		1	
31.	7 May	Aygepar	2200	AK	2	
32.		Eraskh	2245		5	
33.		Shavarshavan	2350		1	
34.	8 May	Eraskh	1315	AK	5	
35.		Berqaber	2115	PK	15	
36.		Aygepar	2310	AK	1	
37.		Berdavan	2335		15	
38.	9 May	Chinari	1550	SVD	2	
39.		Aygepar	1710		2	
40.		Tigranashen	1900	AK	1	
41.			2030		2	
42.	10 May	Aygepar	0215	AK	4	
43.		Chinari	0815	SVD	2	

No.	*Date*	*Direction*	*Time*	*Type of weapon*	*Ammunition*	*Results of violations*
44.		Movses	1500	AK	2	
45.		N. Karmiraghbyur	1625		1	
46.	11 May	Mehrab	0310	RPK	20	
47.	12 May	Aygepar	1245	AK	2	
48.		Chinari	1625	SVD	3	
49.			1630		5	
50.	13 May	Sevakavan	2025	DSHK	2	
51.		Chinari	2030	SVD	4	
52.			2100		3	
53.		Baghanis		AK	3	
54.		Movses	2215		2	
55.		Berqaber	2315	PK	50	
56.				DSHK	20	
57.	14 May	Movses	0100	AK	30	
58.		Aygepar	0415	PK	3	
59.				AK	7	
60.			1830	PK	1	
61.		Eraskh	1645	SVD	8	
62.			2135	PK	4	
63.	15 May	Aygepar	1000	AK	4	
64.		Movses	1155		1	
65.		Chinari	1420	SVD	7	
66.		Eraskh	1630		1	
67.		Barcruni	2000	AK	2	
68.	17 May	Chinari	1230	Black Arrow	5	
69.			1500-1550		7	
70.			1640	SVD	5	
71.		Aygedzor	1730	AK	60	

No.	Date	Direction	Time	Type of weapon	Ammunition	Results of violations
72.				SVD	30	
73.		Aygepar	1230	SVD	7	
74.			1545	AK	1	
75.	18 May	Chinari	1120	SVD	8	
76.			1210	Black Arrow	7	
77.			2155	SVD	2	
78.		Paravaqar	1315	AK	5	
79.	19 May	Baghanis	1120	AK	20	
80.	20 May	Khndzorut	1320	AK	1	
81.	21 May	Chinari	1800	SVD	2	
82.		Barcruni	1725	Black Arrow	3	
83.	22 May	Vahan	1630	SVD	15	
84.				PK	30	
85.		Movses	1805	AK	1	
86.		N. Karmiraghbyur	1900		5	
87.		Jil	2015	PK	70	
88.				AK	80	
89.	23 May	Aygepar	0140	AK	1	
90.		Aygedzor	1220		60	
91.			2020		20	
92.	24 May	Aygedzor	2130	AK	25	
93.			2140		70	
94.	25 May	N. Karmiraghbyur	1225	AK	1	
95.		Vosklevan	2355		35	
96.	26 May	N. Karmiraghbyur	0025	AK	2	
97.		Baghanis	1435		5	
98.	27 May	Aygepar	1340	DSHK	4	
99.		Mehrab	2035	AK	20	
100.				Black Arrow	1	

No.	*Date*	*Direction*	*Time*	*Type of weapon*	*Ammunition*	*Results of violations*
101.	28 May	Voskepar	1345	AK	10	
102.		Voskevan	1345		15	
103.		Eraskh	1800		6	
104.			2050	SVD	1	
105.		Vazashen	1905		5	
106.		Chinari	2140	PK	40	
107.			2215	SVD	8	
108.		Movses	2145	AK	2	
109.	29 May	Vazashen	2140	PK	10	Erik Mkhoyan was wounded in combat by the Azerbaijani side at 1615 near the village of Jraberd, on the border with Azerbaijan.
110.		Khachik	2245	AK	2	
111.	30 May	Chambarak	1300	PK	15	
112.		Tigranashen	1400	AK	10	
113.		Mehrab	1530		10	
114.		Vazashen	2035	PK	2	
115.	31 May	Khndzorut	1010	PK	20	
116.		Baghanis	1415	AK	2	
117.		N. Karmiraghbyur	1805		2	
118.			1930		3	
119.		Vazashen	2210	SVD	3	
120.				PK	10	

United Nations A/67/887

General Assembly

Distr.: General
12 June 2013
English
Original: Russian

Sixty-seventh session
Agenda item 34
Protracted conflicts in the GUAM area and their implications for international peace, security and development

Letter dated 10 June 2013 from the Permanent Representative of the Russian Federation to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to transmit herewith a statement by Mr. V. Chirikba, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Abkhazia, in connection with the draft resolution on the "Status of internally displaced persons and refugees from Abkhazia, Georgia, and the Tskhinvali region/South Ossetia, Georgia" before the General Assembly at its sixty-seventh session (see annex).

I should be grateful if you would have this letter and its annex circulated as a document of the sixty-seventh session of the General Assembly.

(*Signed*) Vitaly **Churkin**

13-36155 (E) 180613 200613

Please recycle

Annex to the letter dated 10 June 2013 from the Permanent Representative of the Russian Federation to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

[Original: English]

Statement of the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Abkhazia to members of the General Assembly

I take this opportunity to bring it to your attention that Georgia is intending to introduce to the General Assembly its annual draft resolution on the "Status of internally displaced persons and refugees from Abkhazia, Georgia, and the Tskhinvali region/South Ossetia, Georgia", on 13 June 2013.

The main objective of this initiative is to gain international support for Tbilisi's claim over the Republics of Abkhazia and South Ossetia, which is absolutely illegitimate and baseless in terms of international law.

Prior to the admission of Georgia into the family of the United Nations in 1992, the Government and Parliament of the Republic of Abkhazia made an appeal to the Secretary-General of the United Nations warning the United Nations against recognition of the so-called territorial integrity of Georgia within the borders of the former Soviet Union Republic of Georgia since there was already legal territorial dispute between the Republic of Abkhazia and the Republic of Georgia, the latter of which claimed the territory of Abkhazia. By that time, Abkhazia had implemented its right to self-determination and consequent independence from Georgia in accordance with the Soviet law on the procedure of the settlement of questions connected with the withdrawal of a Republic of the Union from the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics of 3 April 1990.

Adoption of any international political document, even if it is not legally binding, should be based on careful consideration of all the facts and arguments of all parties concerned.

Georgia's appeal to the participants of the Geneva discussions "to intensify their efforts to establish a durable peace and to commit to enhanced confidence-building measures" seems inconsistent with Tbilisi's categorical refusal to sign a legally binding agreement on the non-use of force with the Republics of Abkhazia and South Ossetia.

The return of all displaced persons to their former homes cannot be conducted in a situation where there is a risk of renewed hostilities. The principle of non-refoulement (article 33 of the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees prohibits the expulsion of refugees or their forced return) should have the same value as the right to return in the context of the Georgian-Abkhazian conflict. The concerns of the receiving population about accepting massive numbers of Georgian refugees, without considering the economic, political and security implications of such a mass return, should prevail.

Georgia constantly inflates the numbers of refugees and receives substantial international aid for these exaggerated numbers. Georgia should bear the responsibility for the promotion of social reintegration of displaced persons living

on its territory according to article 34 of the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees.

The problem of refugees should not be used as an instrument of political pressure. We are convinced that the Georgian initiative is counterproductive and will only complicate the situation in the region, delay resolution of the existing humanitarian problems and further undermine the level of trust between Abkhazia, South Ossetia and Georgia, impeding the settlement of refugee issues.

The Abkhazian side is convinced that Georgian attempts to put forward a politicized and one-sided resolution for a vote at the General Assembly seriously undermine the efforts of the international community, as well as of the Abkhaz side, to discuss relevant issues at the international discussions in Geneva on security and stability in the Caucasus.

It is worth mentioning that the Abkhaz side is constantly denied the opportunity to present its own position on the refugee issue before the esteemed delegates of the General Assembly.

Given the importance of peace, security and stability in this region, and of the necessity to address the concerns of all parties involved, not only those of the Georgian side, we would highly appreciate it if your esteemed Governments abstain from supporting the Georgian draft resolution this year.

(*Signed*) V. **Chirikba**

Enclosure

On the origins of the conflict between the Republic of Abkhazia and the Republic of Georgia

In 1810 Abkhazia voluntarily joined the Russian Empire as a self-governing Principality, separately from Georgia. Following the wars in the Caucasus in the second half of the nineteenth century, a large part of the indigenous Abkhaz population left Abkhazia, and its territory became an attractive ground for Georgia's expansion. Georgia's ultranationalist circles intensified their activities to establish control over Abkhazia after the break-up of the Russian Empire. In May 1918, the newly established Georgian Democratic Republic, supported by German troops, occupied and annexed Abkhazia.

On 31 March 1921, following the establishment of the Soviet rule, the Soviet Socialist Republic of Abkhazia was proclaimed. Two months later, the new authorities of Georgia recognized its independence.

The Soviet Socialist Republic of Abkhazia took part in the establishment of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics as a sovereign State, and its representative signed the Treaty on the Establishment of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in December 1922.

Starting from February 1922 until February 1931, the Soviet Socialist Republic of Abkhazia was united with the Soviet Socialist Republic of Georgia on an equal basis to form a common State called the "Treaty-based Soviet Socialist Republic of Abkhazia". However, in February 1931, by the order of Joseph Stalin and against the will of the Abkhaz people, the Treaty-based Soviet Socialist Republic of Abkhazia was transformed into an autonomous republic and was made part of the Soviet Socialist Republic of Georgia. The encroachment upon the sovereign rights of Abkhazia and its lowered status of autonomy within Georgia resulted in public outrage and a national gathering, which vehemently protested such decision.

In 1937, one of the darkest periods in the contemporary history of Abkhazia started. Stalin's secret services chief, Lavrentiy Beria, initiated a wave of terror and repression in the Republic in order to annihilate the political and intellectual elite of the Abkhaz people. The policy of intensified Georgianization was pursued: Georgian script was imposed instead of Abkhaz writing, original Abkhaz place names were changed to Georgian ones, teaching in the Georgian language replaced teaching in the Abkhaz language, the Abkhaz population was prohibited from calling themselves a people. During the period from 1937 to 1953, tens of thousands of Georgians were moved from Georgia to Abkhazia, with the aim of altering the ethnic and demographic composition of the population of Abkhazia.

After the collapse of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, on 23 July 1992, the Supreme Council of Abkhazia pronounced Abkhazia a sovereign State, subject to international law. At the same time, the Parliament of Abkhazia invited the leadership of Georgia to begin negotiations on establishing equal relations on the basis of a federal agreement.

In response, Georgia started a war of aggression against Abkhazia that lasted for 13 months. More than 7,000 people were killed, and 200,000 to 250,000 people (out of 550,000 people who lived in Abkhazia before the war) became refugees. In

September 1993, the Abkhaz forces gained a decisive victory over the Georgian troops. Abkhaz nationhood was fully restored.

As a result of United Nations-sponsored talks between Abkhazia and Georgia, on 14 May 1994, the Agreement on the Ceasefire and Separation of Forces was signed in Moscow.

Starting in June 1994, the Collective Peacekeeping Forces of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) were deployed in the conflict zone on the basis of this agreement and the subsequent decision of the Council of the CIS Heads of State. The United Nations Security Council established the United Nations Observer Mission in Georgia (UNOMIG).

In 1994, the Group of Friends of the Secretary-General for Georgia, with the participation of the Russian Federation, the United Kingdom, Germany, France and the United States of America, was established.

On 19 January 1996, the Council of the CIS Heads of State adopted a decision on measures for the settlement of the conflict in Abkhazia that imposed restrictions regarding official trade and economic, financial, transport and other operations with Abkhazia. This was meant as an effective blockade of Abkhazia in order to bend Abkhazia to the will of Georgia.

On 6 and 7 March 2003, a meeting was held in Sochi between Vladimir Putin, President of the Russian Federation, and Eduard Shevamadze, President of Georgia, with the participation of the Abkhaz side. It was decided to set up three working groups with the participation of the Russian Federation, Georgia and Abkhazia: (a) on the return of refugees and internally displaced persons to the Gal region; (b) on the renewal of direct Sochi-Sukhum-Tbilisi railway communication; and (c) on upgrading of the Ingur hydroelectric facilities.

However, the ongoing work on these tracks was disrupted after Mikheil Saakashvili came to power in Georgia. On 18 June 2006, the Georgian parliament adopted a statement that the activities of peacekeepers in Abkhazia and South Ossetia presented one of the main obstacles for a peaceful settlement of the conflict. In that context, the Georgian Government was tasked to begin the termination of peacekeeping operations in Abkhazia and South Ossetia, to suspend relevant international treaties and the activities of agencies, and to immediately withdraw the contingents of the CIS Collective Peacekeeping Forces from Georgia.

In July 2006, in the upper Kodor valley in Abkhazia, where, in contravention of the 1994 Moscow Agreement, police and military units of Georgia were deployed, the situation deteriorated. On 13 April 2007, the Security Council adopted resolution 1752 (2007), in which it stressed the stabilizing role of the CIS peacekeeping force, called on the Georgian side to bring the situation in the upper Kodor valley into line with the 1994 Moscow Agreement, and to finalize without delay the document between Tbilisi and Sukhum on the non-use of force and on the return of refugees and internally displaced persons.

Having ignored the provisions of Security Council resolution 1752 (2007), the Georgian side continued to build up its army and police presence in the upper Kodor valley, increasing its strength to 2,500 by August 2008, with the aim of preparing another attack on Abkhazia.

Between August 2007 and March 2008, UNOMIG registered 26 flights of unmanned aerial vehicles over the territory of Abkhazia, conducting reconnaissance in violation of the 1994 Moscow Agreement and Security Council resolutions.

The Georgian side thus blocked the negotiation process and made it impossible to agree on terms for ensuring security and the normal social and economic development of Abkhazia and addressing the most pressing problems facing its population.

In that context, on 6 March 2008, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation sent an official note to the CIS Executive Committee stating that, in view of the changed situation, it considered itself to be no longer bound by the provisions of the decision of the CIS Council of Heads of State on measures for the settlement of the conflict in Abkhazia, Georgia, of 19 January 1996 banning official trade and economic, financial, transport and other operations with Abkhazia. Earlier, the Group of Friends of the Secretary-General for Georgia had repeatedly recommended that the economic sanctions against Abkhazia be lifted. The Security Council supported this recommendation in its resolution 1781 (2007) of 15 October 2007.

In the course of his interviews with Mikheil Saakashvili on 6 June 2008 in Saint Petersburg and on 6 July 2008 in Astana, President Dmitry Medvedev called on Georgia to sign an agreement on the non-use of force and security safeguards with Abkhazia and South Ossetia and to conclude an arrangement on the withdrawal of Georgian troops and police forces from upper Kodor valley and the de-escalation of the situation there.

The night of 7 to 8 August 2008 marked the culmination of the policy of provocation on the part of Tbilisi. The Georgian side unleashed full-scale military actions against South Ossetia using heavy armament and military equipment (aviation, tanks, howitzers and multiple rocket launchers) despite the assurances on the non-use of force made by Mikheil Saakashvili a few hours earlier. The headquarters of the Joint Peacekeeping Forces was heavily attacked, and fire was aimed at its observation posts and at living quarters, graveyards and cultural monuments. The shells also hit the office of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) where OSCE observers were located. On 8 August, Georgian troops entered the South Ossetian capital Tskhinval.

In order to repel the Georgian attack and to comply with the commitments of the Russian Federation under the 1992 Agreement, in accordance with Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, the units of the armed forces of the Russian Federation entered South Ossetia to assist the Russian peacekeepers. On 12 August 2008, after the liberation of South Ossetia and the suppression of the Georgian positions that were bombing its territory, Dmitry Medvedev, President of the Russian Federation, decided to conclude the operation as it had achieved its objectives. The security of peacekeeping forces and civil population was restored.

On 12 August, the Abkhaz side started an operation to re-establish its control over the strategically important upper Kodor valley and to force the Georgian armed formations out of the valley. On 13 August, Abkhaz sovereignty over the valley was restored.

On 25 August 2008, both Chambers of the Russian Federal Assembly unanimously adopted statements in support of independence of South Ossetia and

Abkhazia and recommended that the executive branch implement all procedures necessary for their recognition by the Russian side in response to the official request of Abkhaz and South Ossetian authorities.

On 26 August 2008, Dmitry Medvedev, President of the Russian Federation, signed decrees on the recognition of independence of Abkhazia and South Ossetia by the Russian Federation.